

****Title:** George L. Parks vs. Province of Tarlac et al., 49 Phil. 142 (1926)**

****Facts:****

On October 18, 1910, Concepcion Cirer and James Hill donated a parcel of land to the municipality of Tarlac, Province of Tarlac. The donation document included specific conditions that a central school should be erected, and a public park created on the land within six months from the ratification of the donation document. The municipality of Tarlac accepted the donation, and the land was eventually registered under its name. On January 21, 1921, Concepcion Cirer and James Hill sold the same parcel of land to George L. Parks. Subsequently, on August 24, 1923, the municipality of Tarlac transferred the parcel to the Province of Tarlac, and the Province registered the land under its name.

George L. Parks filed a complaint seeking to be declared the absolute owner of the parcel of land, the annulment of the transfer from the municipality to the province, and the cancellation of the title issued to the Province of Tarlac. Parks argued that the conditions of the donation were not met, rendering the donation ineffective, and claimed ownership based on his purchase from Cirer and Hill.

****Procedural Posture:****

Parks brought his action to the lower court, which dismissed his complaint. Parks then appealed this decision to the Supreme Court of the Philippines.

****Issues:****

1. Whether the donation from Concepcion Cirer and James Hill to the municipality of Tarlac was effective despite the alleged non-compliance with the conditions stipulated.
2. Whether the sale of the property by Cirer and Hill to George L. Parks was valid.
3. Whether the action for revocation of the donation due to non-compliance with conditions had prescribed.

****Court's Decision:****

The Supreme Court affirmed the lower court's decision, dismissing the complaint filed by Parks.

1. ****Effectiveness of Donation:****

- The Court ruled that the condition for the establishment of a central school and a public park was not a condition precedent but a condition subsequent. As the donation had already taken effect, the failure to meet these conditions could be grounds for revocation but did not prevent the initial transfer of title.

- Parks' argument that the title never transferred to the municipality because of the non-compliance with conditions was incorrect because the right to use the land would have provided the municipality legal possession, barring no revocation occurred.

2. **Validity of the Sale:**

- When Cirer and Hill sold the land to Parks, they were no longer the owners as the donation had already transferred ownership to the municipality. Hence, they could not have validly sold the property to Parks.

- Moreover, the municipality of Tarlac's transfer of the land to the Province was valid as the title was appropriately in the municipality's name at that time.

3. **Prescription of the Action for Revocation:**

- The Court noted that the right to revoke the donation had prescribed within ten years from when the right of action accrued on April 19, 1911. Parks' complaint was filed on July 5, 1924, more than ten years after the time limit, thus barring the action based on prescription.

Doctrine:

- A condition subsequent is one that affects the continued enjoyment of a right after it has been vested, rather than preventing a right from being established in the first place.

- Actions for the revocation of donations due to non-compliance with conditions are subject to a prescriptive period of ten years.

Class Notes:

- **Condition Precedent vs. Condition Subsequent:** Understanding the difference is crucial in property law. A condition precedent is one that must be fulfilled before a right is acquired, while a condition subsequent relates to the continuation of a right already vested.

- **Prescription Periods:** Familiarity with the statute of limitations for legal actions is essential. In this case, actions for revocation of donations for non-compliance must be brought within ten years.

- **Property Transfer:** Once ownership of a property is legally transferred, any subsequent sale by the original owner is void. Confirm the current owner through proper registration and documentation.

Historical Background:

This case arose during the American colonial period in the Philippines, reflecting the influence of American legal principles, particularly in property law and the application of

conditions subsequent. The case emphasizes the statutory requirement to act within prescribed periods, showcasing the systemic shift towards written laws and codified procedures in line with American legal traditions. The decision demonstrates the judicial approach to donations and the significance of formal conditions within contracts during early 20th-century Philippine jurisprudence.